

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application following entry of the above amendments. In the February 24, 2006 Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,933,004 to Jackson et al. (hereinafter "Jackson").

In this response, Applicant has traversed the examiner's rejection of claims 1-20 and has added new claim 21. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-21, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

II. Claim 1

In the February 24, 2006 Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson. As set forth in MPEP § 2131, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F. 2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 1 includes the limitation that "the second current coil constructed substantially identical in shape to the first current coil such that the second current coil is interchangeable with the first current coil". As set forth in the specification, when the current coils 22 and 24 have an identical design, economies are realized in manufacturing, stocking and distribution. In particular, when the coils have a substantially identical design, and may be used interchangeably, economies are realized in manufacturing.

The Jackson reference does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1. For example, the Jackson reference does not disclose a first current coil and a second current coil wherein “the second current coil constructed substantially identical in shape to the first current coil such that the second current coil is interchangeable with the first current coil”, as set forth in claim 1. Instead, as shown in Fig. 1 of Jackson, Jackson discloses two differently shaped current coils 18a and 18b. In particular, the Jackson reference appears to disclose one current coil 18a that is a mirror image of a second current coil 18b. These two current coils are neither “substantially identical in design” nor are they “interchangeable” as required by claim 1.

In the February 24, 2006 Office action, the examiner states, “[t]he first and the second current coil (18a, 18b) are substantially identical in shape, because of figure 1 only illustrate the side view of the meter, further the applicant is using the term “SUBSTANTIALLY” which means the two are not exactly identical” ((sic) see p. 2 of the February 24, 2006 Office action). From this statement in the February 2, 2006 Office action, the examiner appears to make two points. First, the examiner appears to argue that the first and second current coils 18a and 18b of Jackson are substantially identical in shape even though the side view of figure 1 of Jackson does not show coils that are substantially identical in shape. If this is the case, applicant respectfully requests the examiner to indicate where Jackson discloses that current coils 18a and 18b are identical and not mirror images. Applicant believes the only disclosure in Jackson is for coils that are mirror images of each other.

Second, the examiner’s statement on page 2 of the February 24, 2006, Office action seems to suggest that the claim term “substantially” provides for sufficient

differences in the current coils such that the claims read on the mirror image current coils in Jackson. Applicant respectfully traverses this position by the examiner. In particular, claim 1 includes the limitation that the “second coil is interchangeable with the first coil.” Coil 18a of Jackson is not interchangeable with coil 18b. In particular, coil 18a could not be used in place of coil 18b in Jackson. Thus, the coils 18a and 18b of Jackson are not “substantially identical in shape ... such that the second current coil is interchangeable with the first current coil” as required by claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Jackson does not disclose all limitations of claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable and the examiner’s rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Jackson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

III. Claim 12

In the February 24, 2006 Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson. As set forth in MPEP § 2131, “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F. 2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

It is respectfully submitted that that the Jackson reference does not disclose all the limitations of claim 12. For example, the Jackson reference does not disclose a current coil including five sections with the first, third and fifth section oriented in an axial direction, and a second and fourth section each including substantially straight portions with these substantially straight portions oriented in different radial directions. In

particular, the Jackson reference does not disclose “a second section including a substantially straight portion having a length extending in a first radial direction from the first section ... [and] a fourth section including a substantially straight portion having a length extending in a second radial direction from the third section, wherein the second radial direction is at a substantially different angular direction from the axial direction than the first radial direction.”

As shown in FIG. 1 of Jackson, Jackson discloses a current coil including five sections. Three of these sections are oriented in an axial direction, and two of these sections are oriented in a radial direction. However, the two sections oriented in a radial direction in Jackson are at substantially that same angular direction relative to the axial direction. In particular, what the examiner considers to be the straight portion of the second section (2) of Jackson and the straight portion of the fourth section (4) of Jackson are oriented in substantially the same radial direction Accordingly, Jackson does not disclose the limitation of claim 12 that states the second section and fourth sections include substantially straight portions oriented in a first radial direction and a second radial direction, “wherein the second radial direction is at a substantially different angular direction from the axial direction than the first radial direction”.

Applicant's Fig. 5A shows an example of a current coil that includes a second section 134 and a fourth section 138. The second section 134 includes a substantially straight portion having a length extending at least in a first radial direction and the fourth section 138 includes a substantially straight portion having a length extending at least in a second radial direction that is substantially different from the first radial direction. As can be seen in Fig. 5A, the radial direction of section 134 is substantially different than

the radial direction of section 138.

Applicant made the foregoing argument in January 30, 2006 Response; however, the examiner failed to address the Applicant's arguments in the recent February 24, 2006 Office action. Should the Examiner maintain this rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should specifically show where the Jackson reference discloses a current coil including a second section and a fourth section which include substantially straight portions oriented in a first radial direction and a second radial direction, "wherein the second radial direction is at a substantially different angular direction from the axial direction than the first radial direction".

For at least the reasons discussed above, Jackson does not disclose all limitations of claim 12 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is allowable and the examiner's rejection of claim 12 as anticipated by Jackson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

IV. Claim 18

In the February 24, 2006 Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson. As set forth in MPEP § 2131, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F. 2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 18 includes the limitation of "a measurement contact element, the measurement contact element including a blade contact portion and circuit board contact portion, the circuit board contact portion configured to electrically connect to a circuit

board connection, the blade contact portion including a flexible member biased toward and disposed against the exposed conductive portion". As set forth in claim 18, and as described in further detail on page 14, line 18 to page 16, line 17, the measurement contact element is a separate piece from the coil and the circuit board. As noted in claim 18, the measurement contact element includes (i) a "blade contact portion" disposed against the "exposed conductive portion" of the current coil as well as (ii) a circuit board contact portion configured to electrically connect to a circuit board connection.

The Jackson reference does not disclose all the limitations of claim 18. As a particular example, the Jackson reference does not disclose a "measurement contact element" comprising a "blade contact portion including a flexible member biased toward and disposed against the conductive portion" of the coil. Instead, Jackson only discloses coil blades (reference numerals 22 and 24), and does not disclose a blade contact portion with a flexible member biased toward the blades. Accordingly, the Examiner's February 24, 2006 Office action only references the coil blades of Jackson (reference numerals 22 and 24) when pointing to a "blade contact portion" of a "measurement contact element."

Applicant made the foregoing argument in both the August 19, 2005 Response and the January 30, 2006 Response; however, the examiner failed to address the Applicant's arguments in both the October 28, 2005 Office action and the recent February 24, 2006 Office action. Should the Examiner maintain this rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should specifically show where the Jackson reference discloses a "measurement contact element" comprising a "blade contact portion including a flexible member biased toward and disposed against the conductive portion" of the coil.

As another example of a limitation not disclosed by Jackson, it is respectfully submitted that Jackson does not disclose a “measurement contact element” comprising a “circuit board contact portion configured to electrically connect to a circuit board connection.” Accordingly, the Examiner’s February 24, 2006 Office action only references the circuit board (reference numeral 34 of Jackson) when pointing to a “circuit board contact portion” of a “measurement contact element.”

Applicant made the foregoing argument in both the August 19, 2005 Response and the January 30, 2006 Response; however, the examiner failed to address the Applicant’s arguments in both the October 28, 2005 Office action and the recent February 24, 2006 Office action. Should the Examiner maintain this rejection, the Examiner should specifically show where the Jackson reference discloses a “measurement contact element” comprising a “circuit board contact portion”.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Jackson does not disclose all limitations of claim 18 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is allowable and the examiner’s rejection of claim 18 as anticipated by Jackson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn

V. Dependent Claims 2-11, 13-17 and 19-20

Dependent claims 2-11, 13-17 and 19-20 depend from and incorporate all the limitations of one of allowable independent claims 1, 12, or 18. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-11, 13-17 and 19-20 are also allowable for at least the same reasons the independent claims 1, 12 and 18 are allowable.

VI. Formal Drawings Should Be Indicated As Accepted

In the February 24, 2006 Office action, the Examiner indicated that the drawings submitted on February 3, 2004 were accepted. Applicant submitted replacement sheets to the drawings submitted February 3, 2004 with the previous response, on January 30, 2006. The replacement sheets included more formal versions of the drawings for each of Figs. 1-13 (11 total sheets). Applicant respectfully requests entry of these formalized drawings in the application and noted entry of these drawings by the examiner.

VII. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is, therefore, respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,



Russell E. Fowler II
Attorney Registration No. 43,615

Please address correspondence to:

Russell E. Fowler II
Maginot Moore & Beck
Bank One Center Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3000
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5115

Telephone: (317) 638-2922
Facsimile: (317) 638-2139
Email: refowler@maginot.com